REMARKS

This Request for Reconsideration is filed in response to the Office Action of December 19, 2005 in which claims 1-18 were rejected.

Regarding the first novelty rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-15, 17 and 18 as being anticipated by Fan (EP 1 203 965), this document discloses a method to receive GPS assistance data by a receiving station, transmit the received GPS assistance data to an information processing station of a network, and transmit the GPS assistance data from the processing station to a terminal. In the transmission various carriers and protocols can be used such as packet connection, control data connection, SMS, TCP/IP etc. However, Fan et al do not disclose the idea that the assistance data would be sent in meta-data format. In fact, the formats that are referred to are related to assistance data protocols IS-801 (see column 10, lines 1-17) and the actual GPS broadcast data format which are not similar to any meta-data format.

The present invention contemplates a more flexible system by the very fact of its choice of the use of assistance information in meta-data format to which the assistance information is converted, transmitted and used in the electronic device for positioning. As such, the meta-data format makes it possible to transmit the assistance information to the electronic device over a communication system that need not take the form shown by the Fan et al disclosure but rather can be heterogeneous. The presentation method based on a specific meta-data format has the advantage of a system, according to the invention, that is not dependent on a specific service provider but wherein it is possible to connect servers of several different service providers, to transmit assistance information to the other servers as well as to the electronic devices (see page 8, lines 31-35).

Referring to Fig. 4, and the example of Fig. 3 of the present disclosure, it will be appreciated by the Examiner that, in comparison, the disclosure of the Fan et al publication does not contemplate a meta-data format to enable the claimed method for positioning of claim 1, system of claim 7, electronic device of claim 15 and wireless communication device of claim 18, all of which are limited to assistance information transmitted in meta-data format to the electronic device. Fan et al does not even hint at this advantageous solution.

Regarding claim 2, the disclosure of Fan et al does not show at least two servers divided into a first set of servers and a second set of servers wherein the servers of the first set such as the set with reference numerals 4a in Fig. 1 of the present disclosure are used for receiving satellite signals, generating assistance information and transmitting same to a server of the second set such as one of the communication servers 4b of Fig. 1.

Regarding claim 5, it is not seen in the reference where the specific limitations of claim 5 are all disclosed in any of the signals disclosed by Fan et al.

Similarly, with regard to claim 6, it is not seen where the TCP/IP protocol is specifically disclosed even though Fan et al mentions the internet in connection with data link 14 (Fig. 1) and signal 54a (Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 8, the same as said above for claim 2 pertains to claim 8 as well.

Regarding claim 11, the same as said for claim 5 above pertains to that claim as well.

As for claim 12, it is similar to claim 6 and the comments made above in connection with claim 6 pertain as well to claim 12.

As for claim 13, it particularly pertains to the meta-data format itself and does not have a corresponding dependent claim in the set of claims 1-6. Claim 13 specifically is directed to the meta-data format comprising at least attributes of the meta-data such as shown by the reference numeral 31 in Fig. 3, an assistance information field such as shown by the reference numeral 302 of Fig. 3 etc. and up to and including an end tag such as shown by the reference numeral 304. This claim limits the meta-data format to the kind of a format used in the XML specification and is not shown or suggested in anyway by the Fan et al reference.

Regarding claim 14, it to has no counterpart in the method claims depending from claim 1. It specifies that the system comprises a wireless communication network which is also shown by Fan et al. However, claim 14 depends from claim 7 which, as explained above, is different from Fan et al in that the assistance information is converted to a meta-data format via a server of the communication system. This is not shown or suggested by Fan et al.

The dependent claim 17 is similar to claim 14 in that it further limits claim 15 to including a wireless communication network and the same comments made above in regard to claim 14 pertain to claim 17 as well.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-15, 17 and 18 is requested.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9 and 11-17 as being anticipated by Twitchell et al (U.S. 6,222,483), it is noted that Twitchell et al describe a method to transmit time-stamped GPS assistance data from a data server to terminals over any kind of carrier. The key idea lies in the time stamp that makes it possible to measure the round-trip delay to improve time accuracy in the terminal.

Twitchell et al do not discuss anything about the format of the assistance data. The Examiner does not allege that Twitchell et al show that the secondary assistance data is meta-data and therefore Twitchell et al cannot anticipate claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9 and 11-18 since each of the independent claims in this grouping (claims 1, 7, 15 and 18) all contain the limitation that the assistance information is in meta-data format. The dependent claims thereof (3, 5, 6, 9, 11-14 and 16-17) rejected on this ground are also patentable for at least the same reason.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9 and 11-18 is requested.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 10 as being unpatentably obvious over Twitchell et al in view of Dan (U.S. 6,771,970), claims 4 and 10 depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, and further limit these method and system claims to the meta-data format being extensible markup language (XML). The Examiner admits that Twitchell does not show XML but cites the Dan patent for that purpose, alleging that it would have been obvious to one of having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use this language in the system of Twitchell et al as taught by Dan in order to display the information to the user in the modern language of XML.

The Dan reference does not mention the encoding of assistance information for satellite positioning into the XML format, i.e., the use of XML in connection with assistance information in connection with satellite positioning. Furthermore, the document relates to the tracking of the location of e.g. vehicles, persons or telephones and the positioning of the location by means of e.g. a map in a network and not in a terminal. Therefore, there would be no motivation for making the modification proposed by the Examiner and the modernization motivation advanced by the Examiner is incorrect.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 10 is requested.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of December 19, 2005, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-18 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis Maguire

Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/djc
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, PO Box 224
Monroe CT 06468
(203) 261-1234